

**Cooperative Monitoring Evaluation and Research Committee**  
**August 15, 2002**  
**NWIFC Conference Center**  
**Minutes**

---

Attendees:

Clark, Jeffrey	Weyerhaeuser Company
Cramer, Darin	DNR
Dieu, Julie	Rayonier
Edsun, Scott	Colville Tribes
Ehinger, Bill	DOE
Fransen, Brian	Weyerhaeuser
Frost, Mark	Consultant
Glass, Domoni	Consultant
Hansen, Craig	USFWS
Hayes, Mark	WDFW
Heide, Pete	WFPA
Jackson, Terry	WDFW
Martin, Doug	CMER Co-Chair
McFadden, George	NWIFC
McNaughton, Geoff	Adaptive Management Program Administrator
Mobbs, Mark	Quinault Indian Nation
Parks, Dave	DNR
Pavel, Joseph	NWIFC
Peterson, Pete	Upper Columbia United Tribes
Pleus, Allen	NWIFC
Poon, Derek	EPA
Price, Dave	WDFW
Raines, Mary	NWIFC
Robinson, Tom	Washington State Association of Counties
Rowe, Blake	Longview Fibre
Rowton, Heather	WFPA
Sturhan, Nancy	DNR

---

**Minutes:** July CMER minutes were approved as revised.

---

**Budget:** there are no major changes to the budget that was distributed to CMER in July. A line has been added for CMER facilitation. A contract has been signed for the RMZ resample project and DOE has offered to help with the wetlands regeneration study. Bull trout projects that USFWS is handling the funding for have been removed from the budget sheet; this should help to reduce confusion. CMER is scheduled to receive \$19 million over 5 years and \$1 million of that is currently unallocated. Funding for year 3 has been approved by the FPB; and they recommended no changes to the current allocations.

DNR has hired another contracts specialist to help with initiating and tracking projects.

---

**Review of Requests:**

McNaughton received three SAG requests.

1. Intern to help with the Protocol and Standards Manual: the PSMDG (Protocol and Standards Manual Development Group) has met with a potential intern who would be hired to help with the Handbook. This prospective intern is looking into what will be required by Evergreen State College for her to participate in this project. Her tasks will include integrating the various sections of the handbook into one document with a consistent writing style, identifying sections that need more work, and assisting in getting that work accomplished. We are unsure where she will be housed at this time (NWIFC or DNR). The PSMD recommends that this intern be funded through project development monies at less than \$5,000.00. There is currently \$70,000 in the project development funds budget. McNaughton also suggested that we initiate a standing internship for CMER projects. See request, e-mailed 8/12/02.

**Recommendation:** CMER approved this recommendation.

2. RMZ resample project: the contract for this study was signed August 14<sup>th</sup>. During the original study, data was submitted to the DNR and those data are now lost. DNR is revising their data tracking procedures to alleviate this problem in the future. These data also exist at the University of Washington and Washington State University, and it can be compiled and resubmitted to DNR from these locations. LWAG requests \$2,400.00 to get this data gathered and they request that CMER fund this effort from the project development funds. There will be no additional cost for converting the data because the present format of the data is not obsolete and can be easily converted to a newer program. See request, e-mailed 8/12/02.

Hayes said that archiving will be increasingly important as we accumulate data under adaptive management. We should work on developing a consistent tracking and storage procedure. Things to consider in this process include, but are not limited to: changes in technology, updates to incorporate advances, life expectancy for discs that data is stored on, accessibility; multiple copies of data should be stored in different locations. This task could be a function of the study implementation coordinator. There is a placeholder in the procedures manual for this topic. Funding to maintain this archiving system will also be necessary. Keeping the data in the DNR system will result in two copies as that data is backed up everyday and taken offsite. ASKE format was suggested as a way to keep the data accessible. Sturhan suggested that a small group work on developing this procedure.

**Task:** The handbook committee (AKA PSMDG) will put together a group.

**Recommendation:** CMER approved the LWAG recommendation.

3. The third request involved facilitation and was deferred until the CMER Workplan discussion later in the day.

---

**SRC Update:** CMER still does not have a signed contract with the University of Washington but we are very close. There is a cost increase associated with this new contract. Last year we had a staggered fee schedule for study designs, proposals, and final reports. We are now considering a standardized fee; this will relieve the burden of negotiating with the reviewer. There is also \$17,000 of overhead in the contract; McNaughton is still negotiating with the Washington Cooperative Fish and Wildlife Research Unit to reduce these fees. The CMER budget would pay the portion of the DNR dues that cover SRC costs (approximately \$8,000).

Reviews cost about \$8,500 each so we should be careful about what we send to the SRC. Total costs are almost entirely based on the number of reviews but there are some fixed costs. Martin added that one of the differences in this year's proposal is the associate editor position. This associate editor will choose the reviewers for projects and will be experienced in the subject area under review. This person will also compile the comments that they get back from reviewers and then will get them to CMER. We are asking that they not limit this to UW staff but this is still under negotiation. McNaughton added that the associate

editor was very helpful in the bull trout study review. Schuett-Hames suggests that we capture these concerns in writing if they are not already captured.

McNaughton has been asked to review the new Independent Science Panel Report and examine how this process relates to our CMER process. Last month we discussed outside entities using the SRC; there is much interest in this but it should not create any problems. Outside entities will pay their own SRC fees.

---

**CMER Handbook Progress:** The group has been meeting regularly since the last CMER meeting. Heide drafted a large portion of the manual and that has been incorporated into the latest draft. The group identified that we need an intern to help us finalize this manual and are recommending facilitation of the broader CMER as well. The group is working toward getting this done on the same schedule as the CMER workplan but we may not make it. If we use available time to finish the workplan, the handbook may need to wait.

Schuett-Hames asked if the vision was to complete the whole thing and then send it out for comment or to complete it in stages. There may be several approaches for this. Heide said that one of the things we need is a draft so that people can see the components. After we have a document, we can hold a workshop to work through differences. There are a lot of pieces to the manual and it could be quite lengthy when we finish. Price asked if we have an outline. Sturhan said that we can prioritize within the committee for what we want to finish when. We will provide a schedule to CMER. Heide added that one of the questions that came up was whether it should become a Board manual section.

**Tasks:** distribute the detailed table of contents to the full CMER committee. Develop a schedule for completion and share with CMER.

---

**Workplan Review and Revision Process, Facilitated Workshop:** Since CMER met last, many things have happened. Policy set an October 1 deadline for completion of a workplan draft and the Forest Practices Board would like to see a draft at their October 9 and 10 retreat. That recommendation makes this the priority item for CMER and we need to commit the resources to get this completed.

Schedule for Completion:

Drafts from SAGs	due 9/4 (workplans turned in)
Glue together drafts	due 9/11 (one document created)
Review workplan	due 9/18
Workshop (WS)	9/19-20
Integrate WS results	due 9/27
CMER looks at it	9/27-10/3 (also to policy here)
Summary	due 9/27
Information for policy	9/27-10/3

**Recommendation:** CMER recommends that this work schedule be followed.

We envision accomplishing this by having drafts available by early September (1<sup>st</sup> week). These will be compiled and put out for review, one week review period. After everyone has looked at it, we will come together with a two day workshop to resolve differences and revise the draft.

The purpose of the workshop is to review strategy, questions, program, etc. working together in an interactive session to ensure that we have the right strategy. We are proposing that this workshop be facilitated because there will be debates about some of the content. Facilitation will help us keep moving forward and stay focused. After the workshop, a small group will take the input and finalize a draft for policy; a summary will also be drafted (a clear caveat that this is a draft workplan will accompany the summary). Policy will be asked to provide input as we continue to work on the draft through October. We

envision policy involvement throughout the month to be sure that a broad understanding is achieved and that the final draft meets everyone's needs.

Dieu advocated that there needs to be a method for prioritization in place before we have the workshop. There is a subcommittee the workplan process working on a prioritization process. Palmquist has done a presentation on this and is continuing to work on the prioritizations scheme. Rowe asked what is meant by prioritization. Is it the sequence of projects or deciding what is most important? Martin suggests that it is both. That may be the job for the stakeholders or the policy committee. Martin said that we had a policy agenda group meeting earlier this week and they recognized that the task is theirs; but they would like to see recommendations from CMER. Sturhan suggested that we have policy and CMER come together to do the prioritization. Schuett-Hames agreed with Rowe. CMER can prioritize on a scientific basis, but we should not be deciding what areas get emphasis and which ones do not. Sturhan said that highlighting the degree of uncertainty is something that we can address at CMER. Policy should then consider, in addition to the uncertainties associated with various rule portions, economics and where the emphasis should go.

Pavel added that resource objectives and Schedule L-1 have been acted on by the board. CMER needs to start breaking this down into priorities and sequence. A risk assessment matrix (high, medium, low) should be included. Heide added that delay of the workplan is not an option; we have funding crises rapidly approaching and if we cannot give policy and our broader audience an idea of where we are going, how far we've come and what we're doing, we will move down in terms of funding priority. Raines said that we also need to consider that we are working with a part time group of people who volunteer and consider themselves an advisory group.

Our strategy must capture what we've done, what we need to do; and what our end point is. Pavel said that the policy group needs the prioritization and a clear sense of urgency. We need consensus on these priorities.

#### Decision Points

- Workshop y/n
- Hire writer/manager
- Prioritization
- What does policy need
- Facilitation options

#### Policy Considerations:

- Priorities
- expectation

Workshop Audience: CMER only, regular participants

**Recommendation for Workshop:** put together workplan (take individual pieces from SAGs and make sure the linkages are there); finalize a Prioritization methodology; glue together the workplan; make sure nothing is missing, make sure nothing is unneeded and make sure that the general approach to dealing with everything is good.

Internal prioritization is occurring at the SAG level. The weeks following the Policy committee meeting will be spent on refining the workplan and furthering the prioritization with policy involvement.

It was suggested that we need someone to compile the work and get it into a consistent format. CMER staff was suggested as the avenue to accomplish this. Project development funds are approved by the Board for needs of this nature. Amending the CMER staff contract to get this done is the quickest route. NWIFC will work with DNR to iron out the contracting details.

**Recommendation:** CMER recommends that the CMER staff contract be amended to include this task.

**Facilitation:** Facilitation will be necessary to help us prioritize and stay on task and focused during the workshop and through September. We need two distinct skill sets to get our needs met; one is a facilitator to help us close and reach consensus on workplan details, and the other is for organizational development. There are two proposals for CMER to consider; one is from Doug Martin for workshop facilitation and the other is from the handbook committee for ongoing facilitation and organizational skill development.

McNaughton said that there is apparently an existing state contract for facilitation on forests and fish issues with Thompson Consulting Group. We may not need to put out an RFQQ when there is an existing contract in place, and the DNR and OFM will question whether a different facilitation contract is necessary. Raines commented that we should not give up control to choose who facilitates us on the process issues.

The Policy Agenda Committee has recommended that we use Thompson Consulting Group to facilitate our workshop and getting us to closure on workplan issues. Hansen, who was at the agenda subgroup meeting, indicated that that group recommended that Thompson Consulting should facilitate closing issues and that they think the organizational development issues should be facilitated by a subcontractor of Thompson Consulting or by someone else.

Heide said that we need to make hard decisions about prioritization and it is important that we get a knowledgeable person to facilitate the prioritization process. The facilitator should be at the workshop to get up to speed. Though some of the tasks are mechanical, we still need someone there who can bring us to closure. Martin clarified that this is a recommendation from policy. Robinson said that our options are limited because we cannot initiate another contract at this time.

**Recommendation:** CMER recommends that McNaughton, Quinn, and Doug Martin review who is available, and identify characteristics that we need for facilitation. They will notify CMER of their decision.

Second Facilitation Need: we will need help to complete the handbook and to help CMER with organizational development process.

**Recommendation 2:** for organizational process development facilitation, CMER recommends that we send out the draft RFQQ (forwarded to CMER 8/12/02) after removing item 2 because that task will be completed by an existing facilitator to be selected by co-chairs and McNaughton. There was one abstention.

---

**Managing multi-year Projects:** McNaughton said that when he presented the 3<sup>rd</sup> year projects to the board they asked that we show the current year and any future year funding needs for each project.

---

#### **SAG Issues:**

Sturhan said that some committees have only one chair at this time and this is a lot of work for one person. Pleus suggested that SAGs contact Dave Schuett-Hames for help when they need it. We need to refer this problem to some of the policy leads in a way that they can encourage their people to come forward and participate. A chart may be helpful. Martin said that McNaughton brought this up at the policy meeting, so they are aware of our need.

Raines distributed an adjusted time schedule for data coming out of the Perennial initiation point study. UPSAG had set a schedule to present this during the September or October CMER meeting. They are now pushing their schedule back one month.

---

The next CMER gathering will be the two day workshop scheduled for September 19<sup>th</sup> and 20<sup>th</sup>. The workshop will be held at the NWIFC conference center. The regular CMER meeting for September is cancelled. Next CMER meeting is October 17<sup>th</sup>.